



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/685,238 | 10/10/2000 | Daniel Burton | 26530.18 (IDR-445) | 3339 |
| 27683 | 7590 | 01/30/2004 | EXAMINER | |
| HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP 901 MAIN STREET, SUITE 3100 DALLAS, TX 75202 | | | LEZAK, ARRIENNE M | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2143 | |
| DATE MAILED: 01/30/2004 | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/685,238

Applicant(s)

BURTON ET AL

Examiner

Arrienne M. Lezak

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent US 6,351,776 B1 to O'Brien.
3. O'Brien discloses a user Internet file system comprising: a received folder that contains folders representing files and folders that have been shared with a user and the names of those who shared the files and folders with the user, and a friends folder that contains the user's objects and community folders that contain information that are of interest to the user, (pending Claim 29), a root similar to a home folder of the user, (pending Claim 30), and wherein files and folders in the home folder are available at the root of the file system, (pending Claim 31), (Abstract; Fig. 13; and Col. 20, lines 21-52).
4. Therefore, this reference may reasonably be read to teach or describe every element or claim limitation of Claims 29-31.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3, 8, 11-17, 19, 20, 25-28 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent US 6,351,776 B1 to O'Brien in view of US Patent US 6,389,589 B1 to Mishra.

7. Regarding Claims 1, 2, 25-27 and 34, O'Brien ('776) discloses a method and system for configuring an Internet file system, comprising:

- accessing, by a user, a server that is configured with an application on the Internet file system, (Abstract and Col. 4, lines 13-43);
- creating, by the application, an Internet file system for the user, (Abstract);
- storing, by a directory, a home folder of the user, wherein folders and files in the home folder are available at a root of the internet file system, (Abstract; Fig. 13; and Col. 20, lines 44-52); and
- providing, by the application, a first folder and a second folder in a root of the home folder, the first folder containing folders that represent folders and files that have been shared with the user, the second folder containing objects of the user and communities that are of interest to the user, (Fig. 13 and Col.20, lines 21-52).

8. O'Brien ('776) does not specifically disclose or describe a method and system for configuring an Internet file system comprising creating, by the application, an auxiliary class containing a first attribute, a second attribute, and a third attribute, wherein the first attribute is used to quickly find other users that the folders and the files in the home folder have been shared with, the second attribute is used to store names of the other users and a path of the folders and the files that have been shared with the user, and the third attribute is used to allow the user and other users with common interests to share folders and files of the common interest.

9. Mishra ('589) discloses the implementation of a class store in a group policy for purposes of application management utilizing the Windows NT Active Directory and a LDAP class store schema, (Col. 4, lines 63-67; Col. 5; and Col. 6, lines 1-13).

10. To incorporate the centralized class store of Mishra into the O'Brien method for configuring an Internet file system would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by Applicant. The motivation to combine the centralized class store with the method for configuring an Internet file system is apparent in that the LDAP directories are designed to manage network resources, and the O'Brien method comprises an X-Drive, (Fig. 13), which is a network resource.

11. Therefore, Claims 1, 2, 25-27 and 34 are unpatentable over the combined teachings of O'Brien in view of Mishra.

12. Regarding Claim 3, Mishra discloses a method further comprising attaching the auxiliary class to a user object when the folders and the files are shared with the user, (Col. 7). O'Brien in view of Mishra is relied upon for the teachings and motivation as

discussed above relative to Claims 1, 2, 25-27 and 34. Therefore, Claim 3 is unpatentable over the combined teachings of O'Brien in view of Mishra.

13. Regarding Claims 8 and 28, Mishra discloses a method for file sharing comprising: sharing, by a first user, a file with a second user; adding, by an application, the first user to a third attribute of the second user; adding, by the application, the second user to a third attribute of the first user; adding, by the application, a path of the shared file and a user name of the second user to a first attribute of the first user; adding, by the application, the path of the shared file and a user name of the first user to a second attribute of the second user; and making available, by the application, the first attribute through a folder of the second attribute, wherein the folder belongs to the second user, (Col. 19, lines 29-67 and Col. 20, lines 1-40). O'Brien in view of Mishra is relied upon for the teachings and motivation as discussed above relative to Claims 1, 2, 25-27 and 34. Therefore, Claims 8 and 28 are unpatentable over the combined teachings of O'Brien in view of Mishra.

14. Regarding Claim 11, Mishra discloses a method for file sharing comprising placing, by the application, objects of the first user and the second user into a folder of the attribute that is located in an Internet file system of the first user and in an Internet file system of the second user, (Col. 19, lines 5-18). O'Brien discloses a "shared Internet storage resource, user interface system and method", (title). O'Brien in view of Mishra is relied upon for the teachings and motivation as discussed above relative to Claims 1, 2, 25-27 and 34. Therefore, Claim 11 is unpatentable over the combined teachings of O'Brien in view of Mishra.

15. Regarding Claim 12, Mishra discloses a method for file sharing comprising sharing the objects by the first user and the second user, (Col. 2, lines 15-31). O'Brien in view of Mishra is relied upon for the teachings and motivation as discussed above relative to Claims 1, 2, 25-27 and 34. Therefore, Claim 12 is unpatentable over the combined teachings of O'Brien in view of Mishra.

16. Regarding Claims 13-17, Mishra discloses a method for file sharing wherein the first attribute is a shared path attribute, (pending Claim 13), the second attribute is a received path attribute, (pending Claim 14), the third attribute is a friend attribute, (pending Claim 15), wherein the first, second and third attributes are located in a directory, (pending Claim 16), and wherein the first user has a second attribute and the second user has a first attribute, (pending Claim 17), (Col. 4, lines 63-67 and Col. 5, lines 1-22). O'Brien in view of Mishra is relied upon for the teachings and motivation as discussed above relative to Claims 1, 2, 25-27 and 34. Therefore, Claims 13-17 are unpatentable over the combined teachings of O'Brien in view of Mishra.

17. Regarding Claim 19, Mishra discloses a method for file sharing wherein if there is no corresponding user object, a new user object is created based on the information provided, (Col. 5, lines 5-22). O'Brien in view of Mishra is relied upon for the teachings and motivation as discussed above relative to Claims 1, 2, 25-27 and 34. Therefore, Claim 19 is unpatentable over the combined teachings of O'Brien in view of Mishra.

18. Regarding Claim 20, Mishra discloses a method for file sharing comprising monitoring, by the script, interests the another user has submitted in the registration form, (Col. 5, lines 5-67 and Col. 6, lines 1-14). O'Brien in view of Mishra is relied upon

for the teachings and motivation as discussed above relative to Claims 1, 2, 25-27 and 34. Therefore, Claim 20 is unpatentable over the combined teachings of O'Brien in view of Mishra.

19. Regarding Claims 32 and 33, Mishra discloses a directory comprising: a user object; a home folder of the user, wherein the home folder is an attribute of the user object; an auxiliary class attached to the user object when files are shared with the user; a community folder that includes topics of interest to the user; and a group object associated with each topic of interest, (pending Claim 32), and wherein the auxiliary class is attached to the user object when the user shares files with other users, (pending Claim 33), (Col. 4, lines 63-67; Col. 5, lines 1-67; and Col. 6, lines 1-13).

O'Brien in view of Mishra is relied upon for the teachings and motivation as discussed above relative to Claims 1, 2, 25-27 and 34. Therefore, Claims 32 and 33 are also unpatentable over the combined teachings of O'Brien in view of Mishra.

20. Claims 4-6, 7, 9, 10, 18 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent US 6,351,776 B1 to O'Brien in view of US Patent US 6,389,589 B1 to Mishra in further view of "Role Based Access Control" by David Ferraiolo and Richard Kuhn of the National Institute of Standards and Technology for the Proceedings of the 15th National Computer Security Conference, 1992.

21. Regarding Claims 4 and 5, Ferraiolo discloses a method for file sharing comprising enabling the user to modify granted rights to the shared folders and the shared files, (pending Claim 4), and enabling the user to disallow the sharing of the folders and the files, (pending Claim 5), (P.2 – bottom and P.3 – top). O'Brien in view of

Art Unit: 2143

Mishra is relied upon for the teachings and motivation as discussed above relative to Claims 1, 2, 25-27 and 34.

22. To incorporate the Ferraiolo Role-Based Access Control functionality within the O'Brien Shared Internet storage system would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by Applicant. The motivation for the combination is found within O'Brien wherein O'Brien provides a means by which individual users or groups of users share Internet-stored files, (Col. 4, lines 13-43). To grant rights based on individual roles or roles within groups would have been obvious and necessary considering the very nature of a shared resource. Moreover, Role-Based Access Control would also be an obvious functionality as incorporated within the Mishra class store schema, as Mishra employs directory containers managed by specified group policies, (Col. 4, lines 63-67). As noted above, granting rights based on individual roles or roles within groups would have been obvious and necessary considering the very nature of a shared resource.

23. Therefore, Claims 4 and 5 are unpatentable over the combined teachings of O'Brien in view of Mishra in further view of Ferraiolo.

24. Regarding Claim 6, Ferraiolo discloses a method for file sharing comprising populating the first folder with the stored names of the other users, (p.4), and Mishra discloses a folder containing path information to files and folders that have been shared with the user, (Col. 12 and Col. 20, lines 37-40). O'Brien in view of Mishra in further view of Ferraiolo is relied upon for the teachings and motivation relative to all Claims

Art Unit: 2143

discussed herein above. Therefore, Claim 6 is unpatentable over the combined teachings of O'Brien in view of Mishra in further view of Ferraiolo.

25. Regarding Claim 7, Ferraiolo discloses a method for file sharing comprising creating communities of users with common interests, (p.4 – top), and Mishra discloses storing communities as groups and users as members of groups, (Col. 4, lines 51-67 and Col. 5, lines 1-22). O'Brien in view of Mishra in further view of Ferraiolo is relied upon for the teachings and motivation relative to all Claims discussed herein above. Therefore, Claim 7 is unpatentable over the combined teachings of O'Brien in view of Mishra in further view of Ferraiolo.

26. Regarding Claims 9 and 10, Ferraiolo discloses a method for file sharing comprising, if the first user modifies rights to the first attribute, determining by the application which user the folder has been shared with and what rights the user has been granted, (pending Claim 9), notifying the second user, by the application, that the file has been shared with the second user, (pending Claim 10), (p.4). O'Brien in view of Mishra in further view of Ferraiolo is relied upon for the teachings and motivation relative to all Claims discussed herein above. Therefore, Claims 9 and 10 are unpatentable over the combined teachings of O'Brien in view of Mishra in further view of Ferraiolo.

27. Regarding Claim 18, Ferraiolo discloses a method for creating user objects in a directory, comprising: if a user shares a folder with another user who is not registered with an application in the directory, creating a temporary user object with an email address as a name of the another user, (Ferraiolo, p.4), and Mishra discloses

Art Unit: 2143

submitting, by the another user, a registration form; determining, by a script, if the email address corresponds with the another user; and if the email address corresponds with the another user, updating the temporary user object based on information provided in the registration form, (Mishra, Col. 5, lines 5-67 and Col. 6, lines 1-14). O'Brien in view of Mishra in further view of Ferraiolo is relied upon for the teachings and motivation relative to all Claims discussed herein above. Therefore, Claim 18 is unpatentable over the combined teachings of O'Brien in view of Mishra in further view of Ferraiolo.

28. Regarding Claims 21-23, Ferriaiolo in combination with Mishra discloses a method for creating user objects comprising associating each interest of the another user with a group object in a container of the application, (pending Claim 21), adding the another user as a member of each interest group, (pending Claim 22), and adding each interest group to a list of friends of the another user, (pending Claim 23), (Ferriaiolo - p.4 and Mishra – Col. 4, lines 63-67; Col. 5, lines 1-21). O'Brien in view of Mishra in further view of Ferraiolo is relied upon for the teachings and motivation relative to all Claims discussed herein above. Therefore, Claims 21-23 are unpatentable over the combined teachings of O'Brien in view of Mishra in further view of Ferraiolo.

29. Regarding Claim 24, Ferraiolo discloses a method for creating user objects wherein the information includes at least one item from a group consisting of: the email address; a user name; a password; a first name; a last name; an address; and interests, (p.4). O'Brien in view of Mishra in further view of Ferraiolo is relied upon for the teachings and motivation relative to all Claims discussed herein above. Therefore,

Art Unit: 2143

Claim 24 is unpatentable over the combined teachings of O'Brien in view of Mishra in further view of Ferraiolo.

Conclusion

30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arrienne M. Lezak whose telephone number is (703)-305-0717. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (703)-308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)-305-3718.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-305-6121.

Arrienne M. Lezak
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

AML


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100